



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/235,120	01/21/1999	ARVIND NATH PURI	ORCL5543	5167

7590 04/24/2002  
ALAN W YOUNG  
YOUNG LAW FIRM,P.C.  
4370 ALPINE ROAD  
SUITE 106  
PORTOLA VALLEY, CA 94028

EXAMINER

BASHORE, ALAIN L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3624

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/235,120

Applicant(s)

PURI ET AL.

Examiner

Alain L. Bashore

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant is now claiming "an activity" in claims 1, 3, 5, 11, 12, 13, 17, and 18. The specification is not enabling for all activities.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 8 there is recited "business activity" which is vague and indefinite. What is considered a business activity to one may not be considered a business activity to another.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conway in view of (Bone et al and Fahey).

Conway discloses a computer implemented actual costing method for collecting and presenting an actual cost of performing an activity. Actual costs of performing at least one of: a job performed, an item manufactured or an item purchased, is collected. The activity could be carried out contemporaneously with the performance of the job. There is implemented a selected accounting costing method for actual cost collection and a selected costing method for actual cost presentation (col 2, lines 33-45).

A computer system computes an actual cost of performing an activity from collected actual costs incurred. The system includes at least one processor, at least one data storage device, and processing logic. There is provided a machine-readable medium having stored thereon data representing sequences of instructions which, when executed by a computer system performs specific steps (figs 1 and 9).

Conway does not explicitly disclose:

both costing methods are independent of each other, where the method also may further include a method as recited in claim 2;

a new unique cost identifier is created and stored upon each occurrence of a transaction that affects the actual cost of carrying out the activity. The cost source identifier may include: data structure with pointer and date actual cost was incurred. The stored cost identifiers may be organized as a hierarchical structure including nodes, and implemented by rolling up the actual costs within the cost source identifiers assigned to nodes hierarchically below the selected node level.

Bone et al discloses costing methods that may be independent of each other (col 1, lines 10-60, col 2, lines 30-55), where the method also may further include a method as recited in claim 2 (col 3, line 39).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to utilize independent costing methods to Conway because Bone et al teaches that independence is important because of a particular user's inquiry may not require all database information (col 1, lines 30-32).

Fahey discloses new unique cost identifiers created and stored upon each occurrence of a transaction that affects the actual cost of carrying out an activity. The cost source identifier may include: data structure with pointer and date actual cost was incurred. The stored cost identifiers may be organized as a hierarchical structure including nodes, and implemented by rolling up the actual costs within the cost source

identifiers assigned to nodes hierarchically below the selected node level (col 6, lines 53-67; col 7, lines 1-50).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include new unique identifiers (which include data structure and date) upon each occurrence of a transaction that affects the actual cost of carrying out an activity to Conway in view of Bone because of what is taught by Fahey. Fahey teaches that a decision support system methodology requires current identifiers (col 1, lines 25-35).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to include hierarchical structure including nodes, and implemented by rolling up the actual costs to Conway in view of Bone et al because Fahey teaches multidimensional presentation as desirable and comparisons of attributes require comparisons (col 3, lines 18-27; col 4, lines 12-46).


### ***Conclusion***

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nanor et al, Bernard et al, Isherwood and Skinner et al are concerned with collecting and presenting a cost of performing an activity.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 703-308-1884. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Alternate Fridays Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1065. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

  
Alain L. Bashore  
April 17, 2002

  
VINCENT MILLIN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100